R 2499
D7 W5
ppy 1

Whitaker

Michael Drayton as a Dramatist

Baltimore
1903

Class_____

Book_____

PRESENTED BY

MICHAEL DRAYTON AS A DRAMATIST

BY

LEMUEL WHITAKER

OF THE NORTH-EAST MANUAL TRAINING SCHOOL OF PHILADELPHIA

[Reprinted from the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, Vol. XVIII, No. 3.]

BALTIMORE
THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA
1903

MICHAEL DRAYTON AS A DRAMATIST

BY

LEMUEL WHITAKER

OF THE NORTH-EAST MANUAL TRAINING SCHOOL OF PHILADELPHIA

[Reprinted from the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*, Vol. XVIII, No. 3.]

BALTIMORE
THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA
1903

This monograph is part of an original study of Drayton during five years of pleasant work in the Graduate Department of the University of Pennsylvania. I am glad of this opportunity to acknowledge my debt to Professor Felix E. Schelling, whose sympathetic and stimulating helpfulness made my work possible.

L. W.

Contemporary allusions to Drayton's contact with the Elizabethan drama are not very numerous. We know that he had some contact; and during the year 1598 he did a great deal of dramatic work. In his *Elegy to Reynolds* (1627), wherein he speaks of "poets and poesie," there are reminiscent suggestions of Marlowe, Nashe, Shakspere, Jonson, Chapman, and Beaumont. But the strain of this very poem seems to hint that his memory was more tenacious of epic and lyric associations. In 1598, Meres in his *Palladis Tamia* puts Drayton among the writers "best for tragedie," along with Marlowe, Peele, Kyd, Shakspere, Chapman, Dekker, and Jonson.[1] Drayton's dramatic period paralleled the dramatic incident called "The War of the Theatres." Mr. Fleay finds Drayton in the current of this strife.[2] Dr. Penniman, however, in his careful survey, does not associate Drayton with this dramatic contest.[3]

How close Drayton was to Shakspere and Jonson is not known. He seems to have come to London about the time Shakspere left Stratford. Tradition tells us that Drayton was with Shakspere and Jonson at New Place just prior to the death of the great dramatist in 1616. Drayton was a patient of Dr. Hall, the son-in-law of Shakspere. Both Drayton and Jonson worked for Henslowe, but never in collaboration. Mr. Fleay asserts that Shakspere had an early companionship with Drayton in the Chamberlain's company and that it terminated in a misunderstanding in 1597.[4] This is mere conjecture.

[1] Meres, *Palladis Tamia*, edited by Haslewood, 1815, *Ancient Critical Essays*, II, p. 150.

[2] Fleay, *Life and Work of Shakespeare*, 1886, p. 293.

[3] Penniman, *The War of the Theatres*, Publications of the University of Pennsylvania, 1897.

[4] Fleay, *Life of Shakespeare*, p. 78.

Drayton's name has been associated with thirty-three plays. Twenty-four are positively attributed to him wholly or in part by Henslowe's Diary.[1] These we shall call the Henslowe group. Nine are conjecturally attributed to him, wholly or in part, by Mr. Fleay. These we shall call the Fleay group.

So far as positive evidence is concerned, all is contained in the Diary. Outside of that, all is tradition or conjecture. Mr. Fleay has associated the following plays with the name of Drayton :—*Sir Thomas More*, *The Merry Devil of Edmonton*, some revision of the second and the third parts of *Henry VI*, *The Life and Death of Thomas Lord Cromwell*, *The London Prodigal*, *The Yorkshire Tragedy*, the revision of *Richard III*, and the Induction of the *Taming of the Shrew*.[2]

The association of these plays with Drayton is based upon certain theories deduced by Mr. Fleay from a study of the Henslowe group. These theories have been followed to a greater or less degree by Mr. Elton.[3] If the theories are not tenable, Drayton's association with the plays falls with the theories.

Drayton's dramatic associations suggest many interesting topics. What was the relation of Henslowe to the Admiral's men? What was the relation of an unattached writer of the Popular School to the theatre? What was the financial value of an ephemeral drama? and what were the earnings of a dramatist of the Popular School for his pen work, as distinct from the receipts of an actor or a shareholder in a theatrical company? The writers of the Popular School were often very prolific. Dekker had forty years of productive activity.

[1] *Diary of Philip Henslowe*, edited by Collier for the Shakespeare Society, 1845.

[2] Fleay, *Life and Work of Shakespeare*, 1886. See Index, p. 361, and pp. 27, 31, 41, 131, 158, 226.

Fleay, *Biographical Chronicle of the Elizabethan Drama*, 1891, vol. I, pp. 142, 151.

[3] Elton, *Introduction to Michael Drayton*, Spenser Society Publications, 1895, pp. 26, 27.

Heywood said himself that he had "either an entire hand or at least a main finger" in two hundred and twenty plays.[1] Rowley's name is attached to fifty-five plays. Webster wrote seventeen. It becomes an interesting question as to what these plays were worth financially to their authors and collaborators.

When we touch Drayton's group, other interesting questions are suggested. What in general was the relation of author and patron in Elizabethan England? Were dramatic writers really ashamed of their work? Did men of genius or of literary repute hesitate to labor in the drama? Upon some of these topics Drayton's career may throw side-lights.

As an appendix to this article there is a table of the Henslowe group of plays. From this table we learn that Drayton was concerned in at least twenty-four pieces. These twenty-four plays cost Henslowe £133, 9s, or an average of £5, 10s per play.[2] There is of course an element of error. I think we may safely state that six pounds in money was the average price. The Diary states this sum to have been the contract price for *William Longsword*, *Mother Redcap*, *Henry I.*, *Mad Man's Morris*, *Hannibal and Hermes*, *Chance Medley*. The three parts of the *Civic Wars in France*, *Connan*, and *Wolsey*, each cost six pounds. And when we have a full record of other plays, their price varies not much from this sum.[3]

We notice also that most of this work was done by Drayton in 1598. He began late in 1597 with *Mother Redcap*. In this year we have seventeen plays. After this he seems to have given up dramatic work. During 1599 he has only three plays; in 1600, one play; in 1601, one play, and that upon a subject especially attractive to Drayton; and in 1602 he is credited with two plays, one of them upon the

[1] Heywood, Introduction to *The English Traveler*.

[2] Fleay, *Chronicle*, I, p. 125. The price of *Patient Grissell* was £6.

[3] Henslowe, p. xxv, has additional figures on the price of plays.

popular theme of Julius Caesar. Drayton seldom went beyond Britain for his themes.

During 1598, Drayton earned about forty pounds with his dramatic work. If we estimate the value of money as five times what it is to-day, we have the sum of one thousand dollars. The year before, Drayton had published his most popular and successful work, *England's Heroical Epistles*. This was one of the great literary successes of the day. It must have yielded him some money. Hence, at this particular period we find Drayton with many patrons, hosts of friends, a splendid literary reputation, and probably a fair income. Moreover, he must have been a very busy man. For, as we shall see farther on, he was engaged upon other literary ventures while he was working at the drama.

Drayton's own part in these twenty-four plays it is impossible to determine, since nearly all of them have perished. He is credited as the sole author of the play *Longsword* or *Longberd*. He was to receive six pounds for it. We are not positive that these two names refer to the same play. I have regarded the entries as of one play upon which five pounds were paid. The play is not extant, and Henslowe has entered no record that it was ever completed. All the other plays were in collaboration.

Drayton had eight collaborators. In 1598 he worked with Antony Munady, Thomas Dekker, Henry Chettle, and Robert Wilson, Jr. In 1599 and 1600, Richard Hathway joined in the production of *Tudor* and *Constance*. In 1601 Wentworth Smith worked with him upon *Wolsey*. And as late as 1602 we find our author writing in partnership with Webster and Middleton. His association with Munady, Dekker, and Chettle began early and lasted long. Wilson does not appear after 1599. Mr. Fleay says this was Robert Wilson, Jr., who was buried at Cripplegate, November 20, 1600. Of Wentworth Smith nothing is known outside of Henslowe's Diary, and the only play in which any of this Smith's work has come down to us is Heywood's *Royal King*

and Loyal Subject. Hathway also is known only from the *Diary.*

With these Henslowe plays as a starting point, some of Drayton's biographers, notably Mr. Fleay, who is followed by Mr. Elton, indulge in speculations that invite study. They assert that about 1597 Drayton lost his patrons; for four or five years, from 1599 to 1602, he produced nothing for the press; he became very poor, and perforce associated with Philip Henslowe for the sake of bread and butter. That this is a period when Drayton seems to have been in financial distress. That after 1598 he wrote for another company in addition to Henslowe's, and so we have the Fleay group of plays from his pen. That in 1602 he met Sir Walter Aston, and thereupon his prospects began to brighten and his fortunes to mend. Then he quit play-writing, because it was to him a degradation. And because of this antipathy he never published any of his dramatic work. Let me quote at length from Mr. Fleay:—

"In 1597 we reach a distinct epoch in Drayton's career. He was at this time driven by necessity and the failure of his patron's promises to write for the theatre. He continued to do so for five years; and not till after the accession of James, and his meeting with a new patron in Sir W. Aston, was he able to give up this, to him, unpalatable occupation.

"It is specially to be noted that he, like Beaumont, never allowed his name to appear in print as an author for the stage. The only published play in which we positively know him to have been concerned (*Sir John Oldcastle*) bore on its title-page 'by William Shakespeare.' As no play by Monday, Wilson, or Hathway, his co-adjutors in this one, was ever attributed to Shakespeare, and as Drayton was the only one of the four ever connected with Shakespeare's company of players, it becomes a matter of great interest to investigate what connexion Drayton may have had with other plays wrongly attributed by publishers or tradition to the great dramatist. For if this attribution of the *Oldcastle* play was

due to Drayton's connexion with it, as it manifestly was, the same thing may have happened in cases hitherto unsuspected.

"From the list of plays written for Henslowe many results follow, important for Drayton's biography. It is evident from the smallness of the sums advanced in some instances that it was during this period that money was urgently needed by him. Moreover not one of these twenty-four plays was ever published with Drayton's name attached to it, and only one published at all. He evidently regarded his connexion with the stage as a degradation.

"A further examination of Henslowe's list shows that of the twenty-four plays there given, eighteen were written in about a year, in 1598; while in the remaining four years, 1599–1603, during which Drayton continued to write for the stage he only assisted in producing six plays for Henslowe. It seems probable that during this time he must have been writing also for another company; he had to live, had lost his patronage from the Bedford family, and certainly produced nothing for the press." [1]

I quote also from Mr. Elton :—

"Drayton's career from 1598 to the end of the reign is obscure. It is only known that despite his fame he was a theatrical hack, little patronised, poor, and co-operating with fourth-rate men. It is a barren and dejected chapter. . . . About Christmas, 1597, he first seems to have joined one of the needy syndicates dependent upon Henslowe. . . . This is a sorry record." [2]

These opinions call for a study of the patronage of Drayton; his literary work during his dramatic period; his poverty; and his repugnance to the drama.

The subject of the character and extent of the patronage extended to the Elizabethan authors has never been fully worked up. It offers a broad field for original investigation.

[1] Fleay, *Chronicles*, I, pp. 150, 151.

[2] Elton, *Introduction to Drayton*, pp. 25, 26.

The practice of seeking a patron seems to have been quite general, and was founded on conditions that extend far back into the Middle Ages. Shakspere was exceptionally independent, yet even he enjoyed the favor of Southampton. Ben Jonson's tributes to noble families are numerous and, in addition, he was always welcome at Court. His income came almost entirely from patronage. He told Drummond that "of his plays he never gained two hundred pounds." [1]

It seems to have been necessary for a playwright to depend upon something extraneous for a livelihood.[2] Hence many dramatic authors identified themselves with a theatre or its company. In the later period of his life Shakspere was earning above six hundred pounds a year in money of the period.[3] This was largely due to the receipts of the theatre in which he was a large holder.

It is difficult to estimate the money value of patronage and dedication. This latter was often inspired by gallantry, gratitude, or friendship. Sometimes dedicatory lines were written for a fee. Ward tells us that the ordinary fee for these complimentary efforts was forty shillings.[4]

In the case of Drayton, it must not be forgotten that in 1598 he had behind him a successful career as a poet. His pastorals, his sonnets, his legends, his epic of Mortimer, had all appeared. In 1597 he issued his *Heroical Epistles*. This was his most successful work. Edition after edition was called for by popular appreciation. And it was upon the completion of these *Epistles* that he next began to work on the drama. At this moment his fortunes were very bright.

Drayton was never without some patron to whom he might dedicate his newest work. In 1590 he offered the first outpourings of his muse to Lady Devereux; and in 1630, forty

[1] Jonson, *Conversations with Drummond*, printed for Shakespeare Society, 1842, p. 35.

[2] Ward, *History of English Dramatic Literature*, 1899, I, 448.

[3] Lee, *Life of William Shakespeare*, 1899, pp. 198, 204.

[4] Ward, *Dramatic Literature*, III, 256, note.

years later, he tendered his last work to Lord and Lady Dorset. Lady Dorset placed a monument to his memory in Westminster Abbey. During these forty years he had hosts of friends: many of them noble, whom he addressed once and again. These included the king, the princes of the royal blood, prominent and influential noblemen and their ladies. Queen Elizabeth I think he did not directly address, although his *Eglogs* contain the *Song to Beta* after the manner of Spenser's *Song to Eliza* in the *Shepherds' Calendar*.

With some of these patrons Drayton was on terms of intimate association and manly dependence. This is notably true of the Gooderes, the Bedfords, and Sir Walter Aston. Drayton seems to have made friends and kept them long. His friendship for Anne Goodere lasted throughout his life. He was close to Aston from 1602 until long after the publication of *Polyolbion*. His association with Shakspere and Jonson seems to have covered a long period, and as late as 1627 he pays them a tribute in his elegy to Reynolds. His relations with Drummond, Wither, Browne, are all pleasant. So, too, with noble friends: he had many, he gave them many a tribute, and he was the recipient of many a bounty that he does not hesitate to acknowledge with a grateful pen. The idea that he lampooned the Countess of Bedford under the name of Selena in the eighth *Eglog* of the 1606 edition is wholly foreign to the character of the man as well as contrary to the facts of his relation to her as his patroness.[1] Drayton frequently revised his work and changed his dedications. This change may have been for no other purpose than freshness and contemporaneousness.

The following statement of Drayton's patrons from 1594 to 1605 includes the author's entire dramatic period. Our authorities for the facts are the bibliography at the end of Elton's monograph; Fleay's *Chronicle of the English Drama*, vol. I, p. 138; and the Spenser Society's reprints of Drayton's works:—

[1] Elton, *Introduction to Drayton*, p. 9.

1594, *Matilda.* Dedication to Mistress Lucie Harrington. *Ideas Mirrour.* Dedicatory sonnet to Sir Anthony Cooke.

1595, *Endimion and Phoebe.* Dedicatory sonnet to Lucy, Countess of Bedford:

"Great Lady, essence of my chiefest good."

1596, *Mortimeriados.* Stanzas and Sonnets to Countess of Bedford. *Legends.* Dedication in prose to Lucy of Bedford and in verse to Lady Anne Harrington.

1597, *England's Heroical Epistles.* Dedication to the Earl and the Countess of Bedford.

1598, *Epistles,* as above.

1599, *Epistles* and *Sonnets.* Dedication and dedicatory verses as above.

1600, *Epistles* and *Sonnets.* I cannot learn whether the dedication is missing here. But I gather from Mr. Fleay[1] that the sonnet to the Countess of Bedford is retained in the *Sonnets.*

1602, *Epistles* and *Sonnets.* The dedication to the *Epistles* is here omitted; wherefore Mr. Fleay argues that Drayton broke with the Bedfords about 1601. This edition contains fifty-nine sonnets. I cannot learn positively whether the Bedford sonnet reappears in this issue; but I infer that it does for two reasons: First, Mr. Fleay does not speak of the omission.[2] Were the sonnet absent, he probably would have mentioned the fact. Secondly, Mr. Elton says[3] the verses are reproduced as before in 1600 and in 1599; and we learn from Mr. Fleay that the Bedford sonnet is in the edition of 1599.[4]

1603, *The Barrons Warres* with the *Epistles* and the *Sonnets.* This volume is assigned to Ling, October 8, 1602. This edition contains sixty-nine sonnets. Mr. Fleay says that "in the October 8, 1602 edition the Bedford sonnet was

[1] Fleay, *Chronicle,* I, p. 153.
[2] Fleay, *Chronicle,* I, p. 153.
[3] Elton, *Introduction,* p. 72.
[4] *Ibid.,* p. 9.

permanently withdrawn." This is wrong. Mr. Elton says the Bedford sonnet is in this edition. And the Spenser Society's reprint of the 1605 edition contains the sonnet. Hence there is no omission to show a break between Drayton and Bedford. This 1603 edition is dedicated to Drayton's new patron, Sir W. Aston. The dedication of *Mortimeriados* and *Epistles* to Bedford had been withdrawn and Aston's name substituted. But *Mortimeriados* was now old and *The Barons' Wars* was practically a new work. And the dedication of the *Epistles* to Bedford had been repeated in 1598 and 1599: while the tribute to Lady Bedford had not ceased in the sonnet.

1603, *To the Majestie of King James.* A gratulatory poem.

1604, *The Owl.* Dedicated to Sir W. Aston. *A Paean Triumphall,* to the Majestie of the King. *Moyses in the Map of his Miracles,* to Aston.

1605. This year witnessed the publication of Drayton's first great Anthology, reprinted in two volumes by the Spenser Society. *The Barrons Warres* has a dedicatory sonnet to Sir Walter Aston, "my most worthy patron." Then follow the *Epistles* with prose dedications for each pair of letters. These prose dedications are warm in their acknowledgment of "gracious favors to my unworthy selfe." Among the patrons with whom Drayton is still upon terms of intimacy are "My very good Lord, Edward Earle of Bedford;" "The excellent Lady, Lucie Countesse of Bedford;" "The Vertuous Lady, the Lady Anne Harrington;" "My worthy and honored friend, Sir Walter Aston;" "The Right Worshippful Sir Henry Goodere of Powlesworth, Knight;" "The Virtuous Lady, the Lady Francis Goodere, wife to Sir Henry Goodere." Then follow the Sonnets; with particular sonnets to the King, to Sir Anthony Cooke, to Lady Harrington, and the familiar sonnet to Lady Bedford.

From this long array of dedications, it is evident that it is the idlest conjecture to assume that Drayton had a rupture with the Bedfords or the Harringtons. Mr. Fleay's infer-

ence that Drayton's dramatic career was induced by poverty consequent upon the failure of his patron's promises, has no basis in fact. It is singular that Mr. Elton should have been led to accept such an assumption. In 1605, we find Drayton on the warmest terms with his old friends, the Gooderes, the Harringtons, the Bedfords, and Sir Anthony Cooke. Also he has a new friend in Aston. It is to be noticed, moreover, that Drayton did most of his work for Henslowe in 1598. In this year his earnings from his plays were largest. But even Mr. Fleay does not suggest any lack of patronage at that date.

In addition to loss of patrons, Mr. Fleay assumes that during the four years from 1599 to 1603 Drayton "certainly produced nothing for the press."

An examination of Drayton's literary work will be interesting in this connection. Our author was a voluminous writer, a tireless worker. At the same time he was a somewhat leisurely man. He was apt to set himself a huge task and ply it with steady industry until the end was attained. He seems never to have been idle; projecting new things and recasting old things made busy a long reach of life.

From his coming to London, about 1587, to 1597 he had a period of great creative activity. In 1587 he wrote the dirge to Sidney, in 1591 the *Harmony of the Church*. Then follow in chronological order the pastorals, the sonnets, *Endimion and Phoebe*, *Mortimeriados*, until the period culminated in the magnificent epic success, *England's Heroical Epistles*. During this period of ten years, Drayton's work was almost exclusively creative. He revised and republished almost nothing. *Piers Gaveston* and *Matilda* (1593–4) were reissued in 1596 to make a trilogy of legends with *Robert of Normandy*. This was the only republication. In view of the common assertion that Drayton was always refiling and polishing, the wholly original character of the work of this decade suggests a new conception of Drayton's mastery of his art.

Next comes the period from 1597 to 1605. This was almost wholly a period of reconstructing and recasting his former work. The only important creative attempt was his dramas. He wrote two poems to James, very unimportant. But the period was one of great literary activity. The sedulous filing, the wholesale recasting, the indefatigable labor given to the perfecting of his work, all show Drayton as a model for our own age, whose feat is to make a list of the best hundred books that have been written and published during the current fortnight. Drayton's creative period had been crowned by the *Heroical Epistles*. These were his chief work, very popular, and the consummation of the activity and aspiration of a decade. Edition after edition was demanded. As Drayton satisfied this popular demand by repeated issues, he also revised and republished his earlier works. The sonnets reappeared in 1599, 1600, 1602, 1603, and 1605; and in each issue the changes were many and important. The epistles were reissued, "newly enlarged and corrected," in 1598, 1599, 1600, 1602, 1603, and 1605. The work put upon *Mortimeriados* was remarkable. Drayton was dissatisfied with the poem both as to form and content. "As at first the dignitie of the thing was the motive of the doing, so the cause of this my second greater labour was the insufficient handling of the firste." *Mortimeriados* had been written in the rime-royal of the *Mirror for Magistrates*—a book that Drayton was very familiar with and to whose 1610 edition he made a contribution. Dissatisfied with this stanza, he recast the entire poem into Ariosto's *ottava rima* and renamed it *The Barrons Warres*. This work of revision must have equaled that of the original effort. In his preface he remarks that "it were more than boldness to venter on so noble an argument without leisure and studie competent." The new volume appeared in 1603. Hence from 1599 to 1603, the period in which Mr. Fleay says Drayton produced nothing for the press, there were issued at least three "newly enlarged and corrected" editions of the Sonnets and the

Epistles; the *Barrons Warres* was written, and in 1603 it appeared with another edition of both the Sonnets and Epistles. During 1598, he was at work upon eighteen dramas; and Meres tells us that in 1598 "Michael Drayton is now penning in English verse a poem called *Polyolbion*."[1] All Drayton's work upon his new editions must have been done after 1598, for that year was crowded with the drama. Nor must we overlook the half-dozen dramas that Drayton assisted in during 1599 to 1602. In 1605 appeared Drayton's great anthology. This volume was carefully edited; it has a new dedication to Aston; each pair of Epistles has a dedicatory preface, and there are also inserted many commendatory poems from other pens. The labor necessary to prepare this for the press must have been considerable. Drayton's work easily lends itself to division and classification. Until 1597 we have his first creative period. This culminated in his magnificent effort, *England's Heroical Epistles*. The next eight years are his first reproductive period. This culminated in the great anthology of 1605. Its finest single product is *The Barrons Warres*. But the most significant product of this period is Drayton's drama. This dramatic work was a literary failure, and Drayton probably learned his limitations. From 1605 until 1612 there is a second creative period. Here the original work consists of the *Odes*, the *Legend of Cromwell* that was included in the Higgins' edition of *A Mirror for Magistrates*, and the great *Polyolbion* of 1612. A second reproductive period is then closed with the folio of 1619. This folio appears midway between those of his two friends, Jonson and Shakspere. After 1620, Drayton's third creative period employs him until his death. Here is his Caroline work, worthy of special study in itself.

Of all these five periods, the first reproductive term from 1597 to 1605 was one of his busiest and most important. Here are his great epic successes and his great dramatic

[1] Meres, *Palladis Tamia*, ed. Haslewood, II, p. 151.

failure. He shows himself to be a Spenserian in both these literary modes.

As another theme for study, let us look at Drayton's environment with Henslowe.

From late in 1597 to the middle of 1602, Drayton received from Henslowe, on a liberal estimate, the sum of fifty-two pounds. The usually accepted ratio of the values of money then and now is five to one: hence, in our money, Drayton's dramatic earnings for this period of five years was £260 or $1,300. This is an average income of $260 a year—certainly not large. But of these earnings, a thousand dollars were the receipts for the year 1598 alone. This was his prolific year in the drama. After this year's experimental work, he turned to his earlier work and revised it for his edition of 1605.

Drayton's period with Henslowe is interesting to the student of the Elizabethan drama. Henslowe himself is an interesting character. He was a keen business man and a successful money-maker. His career was checkered; his businesses various. In early life he was a dyer; later, a dealer in wood; still later, a pawn-broker. When Drayton met him, he seems to have been the banker or financial manager of a very successful theatre and a very successful dramatic company at whose head was the famous actor Allyn. Henslowe seems to have financed the company, made money for himself and also for the members of the troupe. While a good business man, he seems also to have been not unsympathetic in his dealings with author and actor; appreciative of a successful play and of a successful performance. When the occasion justified the outlay, he spared no money to make a play successful. The expenditures upon the Wolsey plays illustrate the point.[1] He had the task of managing the money affairs of a group of men to whom the real value of money was unknown. He and Allyn ran

[1] Henslowe, pp. 195, 196, 197, 198.

the Rose; built the Fortune; organized and directed a successful company of actors; and supplied the necessities of a group of authors, some of whom were improvident and reckless in their expenditures. Elizabethan literature is full of personalities, but I have not met any contemporary lampoon, sarcasm, or harsh criticism against this financial backer of the Admiral's men.[1]

Mr. Fleay has drawn a comparison between two dramatic and financial methods:[2]—"During Shakspere's career, we know of only some two dozen plays having been produced by his 'fellows,' in addition to the three dozen included in his works; and of these about two-fifths are anonymous and have been, at some time or other, ascribed in whole or in part to the great master. It is evident that he had the management of the playwriting for his house pretty nearly in his own hands, and that his method was the polar opposite to that of which we know most, viz., Henslowe's. While the latter employed twelve poets in a year, who produced for the Admiral's Men a new play every fortnight or so, the Chamberlain's Company depended almost entirely on two poets at a time and produced not more than four new plays a year. Hence the explanation of the vastly higher character of the Globe plays as compared with the Fortune: hence, also, the explanation of the small pay and needy condition of the latter, and their jealousy of the rapid advancement in wealth and position of Shakspere, who had virtually a monopoly of play-providing for his Company."

This assumption of Mr. Fleay's is hardly fair. The difference was one of genius and personal ability rather than one of method. Nor are we sure that, outside of Shakspere's own work, there was a "vastly higher character of the Globe plays as compared with the Fortune."[3] *The Shoe-*

[1] The notion that Henslowe was a hard, grasping pawn-broker of plays does not seem to be held by Mr. Ordish. V. his *Early London Theatres*, p. 148.

[2] Fleay, *Shakespeare*, p. 284. [3] Fleay, *Chronicle*, I, p. 124.

maker's Holiday, Patient Grissell, and *Fortunatus* were played by the Admiral's Men: whereas *Satiromastix* was a Globe play; and *The London Prodigal, The Yorkshire Tragedy, Pericles, Lord Cromwell* were all written for the Globe. As to the small pay and needy condition of the Fortune's Men, we must remember that Allyn was an actor here; and we have just seen that while actively engaged with Henslowe in 1598, Drayton was not in needy condition. Nor have we learned that Jonson, Drayton, Dekker, Webster, Allyn, were jealous of the advance of Shakspere. All this is part of the cumulative error gathered around Drayton's dramatic career. The owners of the Globe and the owners of the Fortune both made money. Both theatres developed talent. And Shakspere's success depended, not upon his method, but upon a rare genius combined with an aptitude for the practical concerns of life. If, correspondent to the Diary of Henslowe, we had the account-books of the Globe theatre, we should know more of the financial condition of those associated with the Globe.

Another element of the cumulative error that has gathered around Drayton's dramatic work is an incautious statement by Mr. Elton that Drayton coöperated with "fourth-rate men."[1] This statement is hardly true in fact; certainly not in inference. Some of these collaborators may have been only hack-writers. Perhaps we do not know: our information is scanty. Certainly Dekker, Webster, and Middleton are not to be put into a fourth-rate class. Whatever may have been Thomas Dekker's private fortunes or misfortunes, the author of *Fortunatus* or of the lyric *Sweet Content* will not be rated very low in the scale of talent or even of genius. Nor does *The Duchess of Malfi* place Webster at the bottom of the list of Elizabethan dramatists.

Among the authors that sought service with Henslowe, we do not find Shakspere, Fletcher, or Beaumont. But we do

[1] Elton, *Introduction*, p. 26.

find a group of men that may be divided into two classes. In the first we may place Jonson, Drayton, Webster, Middleton, Chapman, Heywood, Rowley. These men were successful, talented, popular. They were authors of some of the greatest dramas, epics, and lyrics, that have enriched English literature. They were influential men in their day; literary dictators of their times; and, when they died, they were respected and loved, and the memories of some of them are preserved in Westminster Abbey. In 1598 some of these men were young and were seeking a career with Henslowe, somewhat as a modern author seeks a publisher. Chapman was the oldest of the group; he was born in 1558 and had reached the age of forty. Drayton had not yet touched thirty-five. Heywood and Jonson were passing only twenty-six; and Rowley was still in his teens.[1]

A second class may be formed with such names as Dekker, Chettle, Hathaway, Mundy. These men are obscure, or mediocre, or enemies to themselves. By virtue of his genius, Dekker should be put into our first class. But because his rare gifts were not accompanied by a tough moral fibre or a strong will, he continually thwarted his own ambitions. Some of the entries in the diary suggest unfortunate pictures:[2]—

> "Lent unto Thomas Downton,
> the 30 of Jenewary 1598 to
> descarge Thomas Dickers
> frome the areaste of my
> lord Chamberlens men.
> I saye lent . . . . 3£ 10s."

Here is one of Dekker's escapades. Poor Chettle was con-

[1]

	Birth-year.	*Age in 1598.*
Chapman	1558	40
Drayton	1564	34
Jonson	1572	26
Heywood	c. 1572	26
Rowley, S.	1585	13
Chettle	1562	36
Dekker	1567	31

[2] Henslowe, p. 143.

tinually in debt.[1] Sometimes a fellow-author had to engage his word for the completion of Chettle's promised task. At one time Henslowe's entry shows Chettle's indebtedness to be £8 9s: this is more than the average price for a play. And finally there is the following record:[2]—

> "Lent unto Thomas Downton
> the xvii of Janewary 1598, to lend
> unto harey chettell, to paye
> his charges in the Marshall—
> sey, the some of . . . . xxxs."

Harry Porter binds himself to serve only Henslowe. Chapman and Bird acknowledge a large indebtedness.[3] We cannot tell whether these loans are made by Henslowe personally or by Henslowe as agent for the Company: probably the latter.

Within this group of genius and mediocrity, of thrift and unthrift, Michael Drayton is an important figure. He had hosts of friends and noble patrons. His literary reputation was at its zenith. Meres speaks of him in laudatory strains.[4] During the year 1598 his earnings were considerable. We have many a record of sums paid to him; but no record that suggests improvidence or poverty. An examination of the entire list of his plays shows that eight of them were paid for not in instalments, but each in one sum: *Caesar's Fall*, £5; *Two Harpies*, £3; *Owen Tudor*, £4; *Oldcastle*, parts I and II, £14; *Civil Wars in France*, three parts, each £6; *Chance Medley* in two payments. But Drayton's share of 35s was paid to him in one entry after the other collaborators had been paid. Most of the other dramas were paid for in two or three instalments. *Hannibal and Hermes;* or, *Worse Afeard than Hurt* took seven payments for its two parts. *Richard Cordelions Funeral* was paid in very small sums to Wilson, Chettle, and Mundy; but Drayton's share of thirty shillings was paid in one sum. In the case of *Earl Godwin,*

[1] *Ibid.*, pp. 126, 127, 134.
[2] Henslowe, p. 141.
[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 146, 190, 191.
[4] Meres, *Palladis Tamia*, ed. Haslewood.

Drayton draws the small sum of ten shillings for himself. This is the only instance of a small personal remittance. In the case of the play in which he had no collaborators, *Longsword* or *Longberd*, he receives the money in two payments. In all this record we find nothing to justify Elton's Jeremiad:[1]

"The entries show the wretched haste and poverty of the authors to whom Henslowe through his agent doles out ten or twenty shillings. We find Drayton receiving these sums on loan, doubtless secured upon work yet unwritten. And we find him at least on one occasion taking the lion's share of the pittance (*Godwin*, Pt. II)."

This strain of Elton's has no justification. Drayton received these sums not so much for "work yet unwritten" as for work done. Many of the entries read "in full payment of a booke." Nor is there anywhere in Henslowe an entry of debt due from Drayton. Six pounds for a play was not a "pittance:" it seems to have been the market price. And as to Drayton's taking the "lion's share," he probably took what he had earned by a lion's share of the work. For the second part of *Godwin* he received two pounds, not thirty shillings: and in about ten of the dramas he received almost half of the entire sum paid for the play.[2] The whole record presents a picture of a talented, hard-working, and prosperous man. Drayton's standing with Henslowe was so good that in at least two instances he was accepted as sponsor for his less fortunate brothers in the craft.[3] There were some unfortunates working for Henslowe. Haughton was in the Clink and Nashe was in the Flete. Gabriel Spenser became deeply involved. But Drayton was not in this class. Perhaps many a publishing house in its relations to our authors might produce a record such as we find in Henslowe's *Diary*. Edgar Allan Poe and James Russell Lowell both worked upon *Graham's Magazine* in Philadelphia: this fact does not prove that Lowell was intemperate in his cups.

[1] Elton, *Introduction*, p. 27.

[2] See table in Appendix.

[3] Henslowe, pp. 131, 98, 114, 166.

We have noted Mr. Fleay's explanation of Drayton's entrance in the dramatic field.[1] "He was in 1597 driven by necessity and the failure of his patrons' promises to write for the theatre. He had to live, he had lost his patronage from the Bedford family, and certainly produced nothing for the press." We have shown that these contentions by Mr. Fleay are not tenable. The question then very naturally recurs. Why did Drayton write dramas?

The answer to this is twofold. He was induced to try dramatic work, first, by the influences around him; and, secondly, by the constitution of his mind. These two things are somewhat reciprocal.

The theatre, as an institution of society, had become very influential. The theatres were occupied by several successful companies of actors. The Chamberlain's Men and the Admiral's Men especially were drawing the attention of ambitious youths eager for a career. Hence many authors were turning to the career of the actor and to the theatres as an outlet for their pen-products, much as aspiring young authors turn to periodicals and magazines to-day. And, furthermore, the theatre offered a price for the pen of a successful writer, just as to-day a periodical or magazine bids for a successful novelist or story-teller. On this general theme, Brandes remarks:[2] "Every Englishman of talent in Elizabeth's time could write a tolerable play, just as every second Greek in the age of Pericles could model a tolerable statue, or as every European of to-day can write a passable newspaper article. Between 1557 and 1616 there were forty noteworthy and two hundred and thirty-three inferior English poets who issued works in epic or lyric form; yet the characteristic of the period was the immense rush of productivity in the direction of dramatic art. The Englishmen of that time were born dramatists, as the Greeks

[1] Fleay, *Chronicle*, I, 150.

[2] Georg Brandes, *William Shakspere*, published by Heineman of London, 1898, I, p. 128.

were born sculptors, and as we hapless moderns are born journalists. The Greek with an inborn sense of form had constant opportunities for observing the nude human body and admiring its beauty. If he saw a man ploughing a field, he received a hundred impressions and ideas as to the play of the muscles in the naked leg. The modern European possesses a certain command of language, is practical in argument, has a knack of putting thoughts and events into words, and is finally a confirmed newspaper reader—all characteristics which make for the multiplication of newspaper articles. The Englishman of that day was keenly observant of human destinies and of passions which revelled in the brief freedom of the Renascence. Life itself was dramatic; as in Greece it was plastic; as in our day it is journalistic, photographic—that is to say, striving in vain to give permanence to formless and everyday events and thoughts."

We may say, then, that it was natural for Drayton to essay the drama because of his environment. But, secondly, it was logical for Drayton not only to write dramas but to write them just when he did. Earlier in our study we have remarked that Drayton attempted every literary vogue. The pastoral, the sonnet, the patriotic epic, the song, and then the drama; all forms were his. Nor must we overlook a very prominent trait of our author: a trait so characteristic that he may be dubbed the *tardy Drayton*. He seldom ventured upon a new literary mode until some one had paved the way for him. In 1597–8 the drama was a successful literary form that well might invite our author. While this was true of the general drama, it was essentially true of a certain development of the drama that must have appealed irresistibly to Drayton upon the success of his epic form in the *Heroical Epistles*. I refer to the Chronicle play.

Professor Schelling's latest volume,[1] *The English Chronicle Play*, gives us for the first time a view of this great patriotic

[1] Felix E. Schelling, *The English Chronicle Play*, 1902.

literature. The *Heroical Epistles* appeared at the time when interest in the great chronicle dramas was culminating. Shakspere's historical plays parallel Drayton's first creative period with *Henry VI* in 1592 to *Henry IV* in 1597–8 and *Henry V* in 1599. When he finished his great chronicle epic, what more natural than that the "tardy" Drayton should now venture upon a chronicle in dramatic form? And an examination of this Henslowe group of plays shows that this is exactly what was done. We can only conjecture as to the content of Drayton's plays. Their titles however assure us of the correctness of our conclusions. He began with the Chronicle theme of William Longsword; and at least fifteen of this group of plays are on historical subjects: *William Longsword, Owen Tudor, Henry I., Wolsey,* the two parts of *Godwin, Richard,* the three parts of the *Civil Wars, Connan,* the two parts of *Oldcastle, Piers of Exton,* and *Piers of Winchester.* Drayton was thoroughly patriotic. He touches this note in his early pastorals where he chants his refrain to *Beta;* he reproduces it in his sonnets; it is the burden of his legends, epistles, and *Barons' Wars;* it is continued in his odes of 1606; and his great spirit rises into loyal rapture all through his *Polyolbion,* wherein he sings the entire line of heroes and sovereigns down to Elizabeth. And this is the spirit that largely permeates his dramatic themes.

Another question that arises in connection with this study is, why did Drayton not publish his plays?

Of these twenty-four plays in the Henslowe group, there has come down to us only one. This is an edition of the first part of *Sir John Oldcastle,* an edition probably pirated by Pavier in 1600, and issued under the name of Shakspere. The same year, Pavier issued another edition without Shakspere's name: Mr. Elton takes the opposite view as to the succession of these editions.[1] As far as we know, this is the only play of the group that was ever published. Hence the natural question, why were they not published?

[1] Elton, *Introduction,* p. 73.

Mr. Fleay gives an explanation in the passage that has been previously quoted:[1] "Moreover not one of these twenty-four plays was ever published with Drayton's name attached to it, and only one published at all. He evidently regarded his connection with the stage as a degradation."

Any answer that is advanced to this question concerning Drayton will probably be insufficient. Because of our lack of knowledge a reply can be only a conjectural opinion. To me, Mr. Fleay's reply is very unsatisfactory. Not only is it a presumption without proof; but it assumes a social condition that is too frequently asserted without controversial comment. There has been published no adequate or specific study of the social status of an Elizabethan playwright or actor.[2] Perhaps a scholarly investigation of the theme might modify our modern point of view in regard to it. It is a common statement that the Elizabethan dramatist, actor, theatre, were all in social and moral ill-repute. If a reputable man worked as a playwright, he tried to conceal his connection with the work. This has been the source of an argument in favor of the Baconian authorship of Shakspere's plays. Mr. Fleay cites Beaumont as one that never allowed his name to appear in print in connection with his dramas.[3] Other biographers represent Beaumont, after his marriage, retiring to his country home because of social risk from connection with the theatre. Mr. Halliwell-Phillips states the case thus:[4]—"It must be borne in mind that actors then occupied an inferior position in society and that in many quarters even the vocation of a dramatic writer was considered scarcely respectable. The intelligent appreciation of genius by individuals was not sufficient to neutralize in these

[1] Fleay, *Chronicle*, I, p. 150. John R. Macarthur of Chicago University is now, 1903, editing *The Play of Sir John Oldcastle*.

[2] Dr. Morris W. Croll, lately a Fellow at the University of Pennsylvania, has an unpublished paper on this general subject.

[3] Fleay, *Chronicle*, II, p. 150.

[4] Halliwell-Phillips, *Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare*, 1898, I, p. v.

matters the effect of public opinion and the animosity of the religious world."

Without many specific facts to justify his conclusions, Mr. Georg Brandes has scattered throughout his two volumes upon Shakspere a sentiment somewhat similar to the above. He says:[1] "In the view of the time, theatrical productions as a whole were not classed as literature. It was regarded as dishonorable for a man to sell his work first to a theatre and then to a bookseller. We know how much ridicule Ben Jonson incurred when first among English poets he, in 1616, published his plays in a folio." And again we quote:[2] "We learn from the sonnets to what a degree Shakspere was oppressed and tormented by his sense of the contempt in which the actor's calling was held. The scorn of ancient Rome for the mountebank, the horror of ancient Judea for whoever disguised himself in the garments of the other sex, and finally the age-old hatred of Christianity for theatres and all the temptations that follow in their train—all these thoughts had been handed down from generation to generation, and, as Puritanism grew in strength and gained the upper hand, had begotten a contemptuous tone of public opinion under which so sensitive a nature as Shakspere's could not but suffer keenly." Mr. Brandes then gives a rather fantastic interpretation of many sonnet-expressions to show why the great dramatist complained of being "in disgrace with fortune and men's eyes."

In this same spirit, Mr. Ward quotes Drayton's line to Shakspere

> "one that traffiqued with the stage"

as having a half-contemptuous turn.[3]

To such an extreme has this sentiment been repeated without investigation, that Mr. Warton not only speaks of players and theatres as being held in low estimation, but

[1] Brandes, *William Shakespeare*, I, p. 25.
[2] Brandes, I, p. 347. [3] Ward, *Dramatic Literature*, I, p. 500.

puts the *poets* into the same class.[1] He says, "John Heywood died at Mechlin in Brabant about the year 1577. He was inflexibly attached to the Catholic cause and, on the death of Queen Mary, quitted the kingdom. Antony Wood remarked with his usual acrimony that it was a matter of wonder with many that considering the great and usual want of principle in the profession, a poet should become a voluntary exile for the sake of religion."

In contradiction to all this, other modern critics sometimes take an opposite view.[2] In his *Outlines*, Mr. Halliwell-Phillips states that literature was almost the only passport of the lower and middle classes to the nobility. As to any argument that may be based upon Shakspere's sonnets, Mr. Sidney Lee says that if any self-reproach or fortune-chiding may be drawn from them, this "only reflected an evanescent mood. His interest in all that touched the efficiency of his profession was permanently active. He was a keen critic of actors' elocution, and in *Hamlet* shrewdly denounced their common failings, but clearly and hopefully pointed out the road to improvement. His highest ambitions lay, it is true, elsewhere than in acting, and at an early period of his theatrical career he undertook, with triumphant success, the labors of a playwright. But he pursued the profession of an actor loyally and uninterruptedly until he resigned all connection with the theatre within a few years of his death."

This whole subject has not yet been satisfactorily treated. It offers an interesting field for investigation. These various opinions as to the social status of the dramatist may be only an inheritance from careless or prejudiced writers. A very superficial glance at the period gives some rather startling facts. Shakspere died a very influential citizen of Stratford

[1] Thomas Warton, *History of English Poetry*, edition of Hazlitt, 1871, IV, p. 88.

[2] Ward, *Dramatic Literature*, III, pp. 236, 248, 249. Brandes, *William Shakespeare*, I, p. 263. Halliwell-Phillips, *Outlines*, I, pp. 105, 262. Lee, *William Shakespeare*, p. 45.

and was buried in the chancel of his village church. Ben Jonson narrowly escaped knighthood; and he and Michael Drayton were both immortalized in Westminster Abbey. John Fletcher was the son of a bishop. John Lyly was a University man and in favor at Court. Edward Allyn became the son-in-law of Dr. John Donne of St. Paul's. Allyn died wealthy and to-day Dulwich College is his monument. Richard Burbage was a large property holder: his portrait still hangs in Dulwich.

In his life of Shakspere Mr. Halliwell-Phillips[1] gives a very significant passage. It is a quotation from "The Annales or General Chronicle of England, begun first by maister John Stowe and after him continued and augmented with matters forreyn and domestique, auncient and moderne, unto the ende of this present yeere, 1614, by Edmond Howes, gentleman." The passage cites the English poets. Its significance is based on the fact that these are not men socially "off-color," but knights, esquires, and gentlemen. Howes says: "Our moderne and present excellent poets, which worthely florish in their owne workes, and all of them in my owne knowledge, lived togeather in this Queenes raigne; according to their priorities, as neere as I could, I have orderly set downe." Then follows a long list from Gascoigne to Wither. Among them we notice Sir Edward Dyer, knight; Edmond Spenser, esquire; Sir Philip Sidney, knight; Sir John Harrington, knight; Sir Francis Bacon, knight; Sir John Davie, knight; Master John Lillie, gentleman; Maister George Chapman, gentleman; M. Willi. Shakspere, gentleman; Michael Drayton, esquire of the bath; M. Christopher Marlo, gentleman; M. Benjamine Johnson, gentleman; Master Thomas Deckers, gentleman; M. John Flecher, gentleman. A long list of literary and dramatic names that seem, by this contemporary notice, to have been held in esteem, although they occupied every grade of social

[1] Halliwell-Phillips, *Outlines*, II, p. 155.

and civil position, from Fletcher, the son of a bishop, to Marlowe, the son of a shoemaker; from Dekker in the Fleet to Bacon in the Court.

We repeat, this entire subject of the social ill-repute of dramatists awaits the investigator. Our meagre glance at it encourages us in the belief that Mr. Fleay is not justified in assuming that Drayton was ashamed of his connection with the theatre, or thought his dramatic work a degradation. It is hard to conceive of Michael Drayton, sober, staid, dignified, respectable, literary, well-connected, with hosts of friends, a great poet, with no dissipated habits,—it is hard to conceive of such a man hanging about a place of which he was ashamed; resorting to a haunt of low repute in order to earn a meal; drawing his hat down over his eyes that recognition might not be followed by ostracism. Drayton's life was very quiet. He loved his friends and counted among them some of the chief poets and most learned scholars of his time. He did not feel degraded by association with the drama. On the contrary, his connection with the drama is part of the cumulative evidence that points to the respectability and influence of the career. It is a nice question as to just what constituted "society" and "social position" in Elizabethan London. Here was a cosmopolitan city of some 150,000 people. Its interests were national and world-wide. Men of every class thronged here and each class must have formed its own social circle. No doubt there was a class opposed to the theatre: so there is to-day. This modern class still arraigns the work of the man of original genius, be his name Shakspere or Kipling. Perhaps all artists whose mode of life and thought are outside the conventional pale become isolated.

But even if it were true that Drayton was ashamed of his dramas, this fact would not account for the absence of their publication. These plays were written in collaboration. Dekker continually published, yet he did not put these plays into print. This is also true of Webster and Middleton. Some other explanation must therefore be sought.

In Collier's edition of Henslowe's *Diary* there is a hint as to why these plays were not published.[1] We have "A note of all suche bookes as belong to the Stocke, and such as I have bought since the 3d of March 1598." Then follows a list of twenty-nine plays, among which are the following of Drayton's group: *Black Batman, Read Cappe, Goodwine, 2 p. black Battman, 2 pt. of Goodwine, Mad mans morris, Perce of Winchester.* This appendix is made up of very many entries. Mr. Collier[2] explains that "all these inventories, &c., were taken in the Spring of 1598–9, and we may presume that they were made out in order to ascertain the stock of the Company of Lord Nottingham's Players in apparel, properties, and plays, before their removal from the Rose on the Bankside to the new theatre, the Fortune, in Golding Lane, Cripplegate."

We are at liberty, then, to gather from these inventories that Drayton's plays did not belong to Drayton, nor to the collaborators, nor to Henslowe, himself; but to the Company that had in charge the destines of the Rose and the Fortune theatre. Hence the matter of publishing was wholly out of Drayton's hands.

Again we find in the Diary this entry:[3] "Lent unto Robert Shaw, the 18 of marche 1599, to geve unto the printer, to staye the printing of patient gresell, the some of . . . . xxxxs." Upon this Mr. Collier speaks as follows:[4] "No doubt it was thought that the printing of *Patient Grissell* would be injurious to the receipts of the theatre: a printer, who had obtained a copy of it, in March 1599, was therefore to be induced to relinquish the design of publishing the play by a present of 40s. This single fact, without adverting to others, will account for the very few plays that have come down to us in printed form, compared with the immense number written and irretrievably lost."

[1] Henslowe, p. 276.
[2] *Ibid.*, pp. xiii, xxxiv.
[3] Henslowe, p. 167.
[4] *Ibid.*, p. xxv.

Therefore, without any wild speculation, we have an explanation why Drayton's plays were not published when he issued his anthology of 1605. The plays were not his. When this 1605 edition was preparing, the plays were still in use at the Fortune theatre.

But we have not here an explanation of why the plays may not have appeared in the 1619 folio. Shakspere's plays were not issued by himself; but they were published in 1623. And if Drayton had desired a precedent for inserting his plays in the folio of 1619, it was to be found in the plays that appeared in Ben Jonson's folio of 1616. Why did not Drayton's dramas appear in 1619, long after they probably had ceased to be called for upon the stage?

Outside of any consideration of the claims of other collaborators, my answer is that these dramas were not worth publishing. His definitive folio contained his best work, carefully polished. His dramas were not of sufficient excellence to warrant a place therein. This judgment of mine is mere conjecture: it cannot be otherwise, for Drayton's dramas are not with us. But this conjecture is based upon our estimate of Drayton's characteristics as an author.

Michael Drayton was a Spenserian. Spenser stands as a great undramatic poet in a dramatic age. Spenser is said to have composed nine comedies; but these, like Drayton's plays, are lost. The quality of his genius was apart from the dramatic temper of his great contemporaries. This lack in Spenser is tersely put by Prof. Beers:[1]—"Neither Spenser nor Pope satisfy long. We weary in time of the absence of passion and intensity in Spenser, his lack of dramatic power, the want of actuality in his picture of life, the want of brief energy and nerve in his style; just as we weary of Pope's inadequate sense of beauty."

A fine summary of the manner of Spenser is given by Prof. Schelling:[2]—"What may be called the manner of

[1] Beers, *History of English Romanticism*, 1899, p. 78.

[2] Schelling, *Seventeenth Century Lyrics*, 1899, p. xv.

Spenser (*i. e.*, Spenser's way of imitating and interpreting nature artistically by means of poetic expression) may be summarized as consisting of sensuous love of beauty combined with a power of elaborated pictorial representation, a use of classical imagery for decorative effect, a fondness for melody, a flowing sweetness, naturalness and continuousness of diction amounting to diffuseness at times, the diffuseness of a fragrant, beautiful, flowering vine. We may say of the poets that employ this manner that they are worshippers of beauty rather than students of beauty's laws; ornate in their expression of the type, dwelling on detail in thought and image lovingly elaborated and sweetly prolonged. To such artists it is no matter if a play have five acts or twenty-five, if an epic ever come to an end, or if consistency of parts exist; rapt in the joy of gentle onward motion, in the elevation of pure poetic thought, even the subject ceases to be of much import, if it but furnish the channel in which the bright, limpid liquid continues musically to flow."

Chaucer is a dramatist. He draws character and gives it life. Spenser is not a dramatist: he is a pictorial artist. His work is static. Drayton is of Spenser's school. In the *Prologue* to the *Canterbury Tales*, Chaucer has given us more character-drawing than Drayton has in all of his voluminous work. In fact, in all his eclogues, legends, epistles, the *Barrons Warres* and the *Polyolbion*, Drayton has not enriched our literature by a single character creation. All through his work there is a lack of humor, a lack of movement, a lack of lyric condensation. There is a continuousness of theme, a preponderance of the epic element even when lyrical expression is sought. There is a lack of firm grasp of actual life. He retards action by moralizing and reflecting. Sometimes he even becomes didactic. He is no great narrator, although he has written so large a quantity of narrative verse. He does not state an action clearly or make it move. His pictures of life are apt to be tableaux, interspersed with reflection. Hence in the attempt to make a successful drama,

to weld epic and lyric for stage-movement, I take it that Drayton's work was deficient in humor, movement, characterization; and was marked by a large epic interference. And, for literary purposes, he did better work in epic forms.

It is a question whether such a man could construct a dramatic plot. I think he might do this. The author of the famous Sonnet 61, with its admirable repression, certainly ought to be able to block-out a plot.

These Spenserian epic virtues and dramatic shortcomings are well portrayed in the two great works that Drayton wrote about the time of his dramatic period. *England's Heroical Epistles* partakes of dialogue form, in so far as one letter replies to another; but throughout the long series there is not a suggestion of dramatic dialogue. The *Barrons Warres* is a theme that had been treated dramatically by Marlowe's *Edward II* and Jonson's *The Fall of Mortimer*. But notwithstanding the dramatic suggestiveness of the theme, Drayton's version of the story shows an utter absence of dramatic treatment. For illustration, note young Edward's attempt upon Mortimer in the sixth canto. Here is a natural dramatic climax. But the episode in the poem has no life or movement. It sinks to the level of a tableau with ethical musings and appeals. All dynamic force has been subordinated to an epic moralizing.

After the close of his dramatic experience, I think Drayton never alludes to it in any of his subsequent work. As late as 1627, in his *Elegy to Reynolds*, he evinces no very high appreciation of dramatic authors or of dramatic products. All this is in consonance with his Spenserian bias. He recognized his limitations; and, very wisely, in 1619, relegated to oblivion that literary form out of which he had drawn all the money it would yield, and which would not enhance his reputation as an author.

Perhaps Drayton's Spenserianism further explains why he never wrote a drama without collaboration. He needed the help and the stimulus of a collaborator.

Two groups of plays have been accredited to Michael Drayton. The Henslowe group has the positive testimony of the *Diary*. Of this group only one play has come down to us. Of the Fleay group, all the plays are extant. But Drayton's connection with these plays is based solely upon certain theories drawn from his association with Philip Henslowe. These theories assume that Drayton lost his patrons, ceased to write for the press, and was forced to work at the drama for a livelihood; that out of this necessity came both the Henslowe and the Fleay groups of plays; that, after he found a new patron in Sir Walter Aston, he abandoned dramatic work; and, because he was ashamed of his collaborators and had a contempt for the work, he published none of his plays. Hence the plays in the Fleay group are largely anonymous. The present writer has attempted to disprove all these theories. As a matter of fact, Drayton was a successful and prosperous man; he never lacked generous and influential patrons; he worked at the drama with men of literary ability; his revision of earlier work kept him busy with the press until the appearance of his great anthology in 1605. His neglect to publish his plays is fully accounted for by the fact that they were the property of the Company at the Fortune Theatre and in the further fact that his genius was epic rather than dramatic. There is nothing to justify the theories that associate Drayton's name with the Fleay group of plays. There is no external evidence that he had a hand in any play now extant except *Sir John Oldcastle*.

LEMUEL WHITAKER.

Appendix:—Drayton in Henslowe.

A table of the Henslowe group of plays. It shows names of plays, authors and collaborators, dates of composition, sums expended upon authorship, and estimated value of Drayton's share in each play.

My No.	Diary page.	Play.	Authors.	Dates.	Cost.	Drayton's Share Estimated.
1	106, 107, 117	Mother Redcape	Monday, Drayton	Dec. and Jan., 1597	£ 6 s.	£ 3 s.
2	95, 142	William Longsword, Wm. Longberd	Drayton	Jan., '98	5	5
3	120	famos wares of Henry the fyrste and the prynce of Walles	Drayton, Dekker, Chettle	March, 1598	6 5	2 5
4	121, 122, 124, 126	Goodwine and his iii Sons— Part I	Drayton, Dekker, Chettle, Wilson	March, April, June, 1598	6	1 10
5		II			4	2
6	121	Perce of Exstone	Drayton, Dekker, Chettle, Wilson		2	10
7	122, 123, 125, 126	black batmone of the northe (Drayton not in Pt. II)	Drayton, Dekker, Chettle, Wilson	May, '98	7	1 10
8	124, 125, 126	Richard Cordelion funeralle	Drayton, Wilson, Chettle, Mundy	June, 98	6 15	1 10
9	126, 127, 128	Made Manes Mores	Willson, Drayton, Dekker	June, July, '98	6	2
10	127, 128, 133	Hameballe and Hermes	Willson, Drayton, Dekker	July, '98	6	2
11	127, 128, 133	Worse afeard than hurt [I regard 10 and 11 as two plays]	Drayton, Dekker	Aug., '98	5 10	2 10
12	129, 131, 134, 136	Perce of Winchester	Drayton, Dekker, Wilson	July and Aug., 1598	5 10	1 05
					£66 —	£25 —

My No.	Diary page.	Play.	Authors.	Dates.	Cost.	Drayton's Share Estimated.
		Brought forward.....	.....	.....	£ 66 s.	£25 s.
13	132	Chance Medley	Wilson, Munday, Dekker, Drayton, Chettle	Aug., 1598	6	35
14	134, 136,	Syvell wares in fraunce—				
	137, 138,	Part I	Drayton, Dekker	Sept., '98	6	3
15	139, 141	Part II	Drayton & Dekker	Nov., '98	6	3
16	142	Part III	Drayton & Dekker	Nov. and Dec., '98	6	3
17		Conan prince of Coruwall	Drayton & Dekker	Oct., '98	6	3
18	158, 162, 166	lyfe of S[r]. John Ouldcasstell—	Monday, Drayton, Wilson, Dekker			
	236, 239	Part I } Cannot separate the cost		October, 1599		
19		Part II } of the two parts			14	6 10
20	163	Owen teder	Drayton, Munday, Hathaway, Wilson		4	1
21		fayre Constance of Rome	Drayton, Hathaway, Munday, Dekker	June, 1600	5 9	1 10
22	198–222	Wolsey	Chettle, Munday, Drayton & Smythe	June, July, Aug., Oct., Nov., 1601, to May, 1602	6	1 10
23	221	Sesers falle	Munday, Drayton, Webster, Middleton, Dekker	May, 1602	5	1 5
24	222	too harpes	Munday, Middleton, Drayton, Webster, Dekker	May, 1602	3	15
					£133 9s.	£51 5s.

During 1598 Drayton earned about £40.

INDEX.

Admiral's Men, 392, 397.
Allyn, 391, 393, 403.
Aston, 382, 385, 387, 390, 409.

Bacon, 400, 403.
Beaumont, 378, 382, 393, 400.
Bedford, 383, 385, 386, 387, 397.
Beers, 406.
Brandes, 397, 401, 402.
Browne, 385.
Burbage, 403.

Chamberlain's Men, Lord, 392, 397.
Chapman, 378, 394, 395, 403.
Chaucer, 407.
Chettle, 381, 394, 395.
Chronicle Plays, 398.
Collier, 405.
Cooke, 386, 387.
Croll, 400.

Davies, 403.
Dekker, 378, 379, 381, 393, 394, 403, 404.
Devereux, 384.
Donne, 403.
Dorset, 385.
Drayton—chronicle plays, 399; collaborators, 381, 393; patrons, 383, 385; earnings, 380, 388, 391, 395; literary periods, 388, 390; total plays, 379, 380; work for the press, 388; why he wrote dramas, 397; why he did not publish his plays, 399, 405.
Drummond, 385.
Dyer, 403.

Elizabeth, Queen, 385, 399.
Elton, 379, 382, 383, 385, 386, 387, 388, 393, 396, 399.

Fleay, 378, 379, 382, 385, 386, 387, 389, 392, 397, 400, 404.
Fleay Group of Plays, 379, 382, 409.
Fletcher, 393, 403, 404.

Gascoigne, 403.
Goodere, 385, 387.

Hall, 378.
Halliwell-Phillips, 400, 402, 403.
Harrington, 386, 387, 403.
Hathway, 381, 382, 394.
Haughton, 396.
Henslowe, 378, 379, 381, 383, 391, 392, 393, 395, 396, 399, 405, 409.
Henslowe Group of Plays, 379, 380, 382, 383, 409.
Heywood, 380, 394, 402.
Howes, 403.

James, King, 387, 389.
Jonson, 378, 384, 385, 390, 393, 394, 401, 403, 406, 408.

Kipling, 404.
Kyd, 378.

Lee, 384, 402.
Ling, 386.
Lowell, 396.
Lyly, 403.

Macarthur, 400.
Marlowe, 378, 403, 404, 408.
Meres, 378, 390, 395.
Middleton, 381, 393, 394, 404.

Munday, 381, 382, 394, 395.

Nashe, 378, 396.

Oldcastle, Sir John, 382, 395, 399, 400, 409.
Ordish, 392.

Pavier, 399.
Peele, 378.
Penniman, 378.
Poe, 396.
Pope, 406.
Porter, 395.

Rowley, 380, 394.

Schelling, 398, 406.
Shakspere, 378, 382, 385, 390, 392, 393, 399, 400, 401, 402, 403, 404, 406.
Sidney, 403.
Smith, 381.
Social status of dramatist, 400.
Southampton, 384.
Spenser, 391, 403, 406, 407.
Spenser Society, 385, 387.
Spenser, Gabriel, 396.
Stowe, 403.

Ward, 384, 401, 402.
War of the Theatres, 378.
Warton, 401.
Webster, 380, 381, 393, 394, 404.
Wilson, 381, 382, 395.
Wither, 385, 403.

IBAp '05

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 014 093 219 A